

IN THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to FIGS. 1, 4, and 7. The sheets that include Fig. 1, 4, and 7 replace the original sheet including Fig. 1, 4, and 7.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets (3)

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this Application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed on August 20, 2004. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 are pending in the Application, Claims 1-3 and 5-7 stand rejected and Claims 4/1, 4/2, and 4/3 stand objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims, but would be allowed if rewritten in independent form. The indication of allowable subject matter is noted with appreciation. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 are amended and Claims 3, 4, and 7 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer by the present Amendment.

In response to the allowable subject matter of Claims 4/1 and 4/2, Claims 1, 5, and 6 have been amended to include the allowable subject matter of Claim 4. As such, Applicants believe that Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 are in condition for allowance.

Summarizing the outstanding Office Action, the drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.83(a) and 1.84(h). The Specification was objected to because of several informalities. Claims 1, 3, 5, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Soviet Union Patent 373,438, hereinafter “the ‘438 patent.” Claims 1, 2, and 5-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Sharp (U.S. Patent No. 1,987,082, hereinafter “Sharp”). Claims 1 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Soviet Union Patent No. 1,178,903, hereinafter “the ‘903 patent.”

Applicants thank Examiner Christopher Verdier for the courtesy of an interview extended to Applicants’ representative on September 10, 2004. During the interview, Amendments to the claims as herein presented were proposed.

Although no agreement was reached during the interview, Examiner Verdier indicated on the interview summary (form PTOL-413) that “with regard to Soviet Union Patent 373,438, Applicants’ representative argued that one cannot tell from the drawings alone the

curvature of the inlet edge of the blades, because there is not a top view looking at the inlet edge of the blades. The Examiner stated that the side view of figure 1 inherently showed this feature. Applicant proposed to further amend the structure of Claims 3 and 7 to further define the edge region of the blades. The Examiner would favorably consider such an amendment upon further search.” The cancellation of Claims 3 and 7 now makes this issue moot.

In response to the objection of Applicants’ drawings under 37 C.F.R. §1.84(h) because FIGS. 1A-1C, 4A-4C, and 7A-7C are connected by projections, Applicants have submitted herein replacements for FIGS. 1, 4, and 7, correcting the informalities noted by the Examiner and respectfully request reconsideration of the objection thereto. In addition, minor informalities in FIGS. 4C, 7B, and 7C were corrected. In Figs. 4C and 7C a dashed line that was initially drawn incorrectly has been removed. In Fig. 7B, a dashed line incorrectly identifying element 208 has been removed and the end of the lead line for element 208 has been corrected to properly identify that element.

In response to the objections of Applicants’ specification, Applicants note with appreciation the time taken by the Examiner to identify specific areas needing revisions. Applicants have herein submitted replacement to several paragraphs in the Specification to correct the outstanding informalities and respectfully request reconsideration of the same.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal Allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants’ undersigned representatives at the below listed telephone number.

Application No. 10/647,340
Reply to Office Action of August 20, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413 -2220

(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\MQM\24's\241911USVAMD 11-17-04.DOC

Gregory J. Maier

Registration No. 25,599

Robert T. Pous

Registration No. 29,099

Attorneys of Record